

The Social Questions Bulletin

Issued Monthly Except July and August by

THE METHODIST FEDERATION FOR SOCIAL SERVICE
(UNOFFICIAL)

An organization which rejects the method of the struggle for profit as the economic base for society; which seeks to replace it with social-economic planning in order to develop a society without class distinctions and privileges.

150 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY

Secretaries: HARRY F. WARD, CHARLES C. WEBBER, HELEN G. MURRAY

The general policies of this publication are determined by the Executive Committee of the Methodist Federation for Social Service, subject to approval by the General Council of the Federation. The selection of topics and material is committed to the Secretaries, who are responsible to the Federation and to the public for its accuracy.

Entered as second-class matter January 21, 1919, at the Postoffice at New York, N. Y.
under Act of August 24, 1912.



Vol. 28

JUNE, 1938

No. 6

THE PEACE MOVEMENT

Everybody wants peace. Despite the lessons of the past, however, 73% of the people, according to a recent poll by the Institute of Public Opinion, still rely on armed force and preparedness to achieve it. The peace movement has split over the question of what to do about the wars now being waged and threatened. Shall America cooperate with other nations in a positive peace program, help to curb fascist aggressors, and give economic aid to their victims; or shall we stay aloof, relying on our historic fear of entangling alliances?

The division is not sufficiently indicated by the terms "isolation" and "collective security," or, to speak more accurately, "collective action." If this issue is eliminated, as it is temporarily, by the breakdown of the League of Nations and the nature and consequences of the Chamberlain policies, there remains the division over the "neutrality" question. Regardless of what other nations may or may not do, shall the United States embargo all belligerents or only the invader and not his victim; both sides in a civil war, or only the rebels against a lawfully and democratically constituted government? The lineup on this question cuts across that on concerted action. Groups who favor lifting the embargo on the Spanish republican government, are working with those bitterly opposed to that course against any concerted action, and vice versa.

Another division that cuts across the isolation-concerted action lineup is that over the economic causes of war. Some of those advocating economic adjustments among the "haves," as well as between the "haves" and the "have-nots," as the way to prevent war are for "neutrality" and some are against it. The same thing is true of those who hold that to get rid of war we must get rid of capitalism. Religious pacifists of varying degrees are found on both sides of both the concerted action and economic causes issues.

Because of these cross lines, no accurate classification of the forces in the peace movement can be made at this time. There are, however, groupings that concentrate on one of the following four points of emphasis: (1) neutrality, (2) covenants and sanctions, (3) peaceful change, (4) economic non-cooperation. There is a marked tendency for a coalition on immediate issues in foreign policy between groupings (2) and (4), drawing in those in (3) who cannot support economic concessions to the fascist powers and do not believe that adjustments within the capitalist economy can be anything more than a temporary makeshift. This combination unites the socially conscious section of the anti-war intellectuals with the socially conscious section of the masses. In general, however, grouping (3) tends to coalesce with grouping (1) in a combination of class interest in the capitalist economy, the political tradition of isolationism, and the religious conviction of non-resistant pacifism. Thus there is forming an Isolationist-Neutrality Bloc, and a Selective Embargo-Concerted Action Bloc. To understand the shifts in formation it is necessary to have clearly in mind the main positions of the various groupings.

NEUTRALITY

This position brings together the isolationists and the extreme pacifists. Fred Libby, Secretary of the National Council for the Prevention of War, and Chairman of the Keep America Out of War Committee, can be taken as its spokesman. His present position stems from his experience in the last war and his Christian pacifism as a member of the



Society of Friends. He very strenuously objects to being termed "isolationist," stating that he is an isolationist only with respect to war, but a "cooperationist" on the economic issue. For years, the National Council for the Prevention of War has circulated world-trade maps and focused attention on an economic community of nations as a prerequisite for peace.

Mr. Libby stresses the point that the present issue is not democracy versus dictatorships. He fears a lineup of imperialist-democracy with the Soviet Union against the fascist states. He views Hitler's seizure of Austria and Chamberlain's agreement with Mussolini and approaches to Hitler as making for peace. He emphasizes the fact that the present aggressor nations have themselves been injured by the aggression of the four great "have" nations, and favors economic concessions to them. He cannot conceive of any cooperation among the anti-fascist nations except an alliance for war. Since, therefore, we are not to ally ourselves with French imperialism, the British Empire and Soviet Russia, we can easily retreat behind the security three thousand miles of ocean affords, and adopt the following program: (1) defend ourselves from invasion, (2) have a referendum on war, (3) make present neutrality legislation mandatory, (4) place an embargo on all arms exports and economic credits for war, (5) look for peaceful change through justice and world economic cooperation.

Lined up under this banner, differing in but few minor details, are the following other organizations: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Committee on Militarism and Education, War Resisters' League, and World Peaceways, Incorporated. This grouping also gets the support of influential individuals of such totally divergent political faiths as Norman Thomas, Herbert Hoover, Robert M. LaFollette, Hamilton Fish, Alfred Bingham, Jay Lovestone, Senator Nye.

The fallacy in the Isolationist-Neutrality position lies in the fact that our economic power is being used in present war situations, and in preparation for others to come. "No entangling alliances" is but an illusion behind which our economic imperialism with its international combination has developed. Since isolation is demonstrably a myth and our neutrality plainly un-neutral in Spain and in China, the practical question is, on which side shall our economic resources be used, and how used without getting us into war?

COVENANTS AND SANCTIONS

This grouping goes popularly under the head of "collective security." It has the League of Nations mentality, expressing itself in broader terms because of political requirements in the United States. It thinks primarily in terms of government action and political pressure on governments. The leader is Clarke Eichelberger, of the League of Nations Association. The main objectives are: the restoration and maintenance of international law and order, and, on this basis, the development of peaceful and prosperous economic relations. In pursuit of these objectives, Eichelberger has directed The Campaign for World Economic Cooperation, and organized a number of prominent individuals in peace organizations, not officially committed to collective action in a Committee for Concerted Peace Efforts.

Eichelberger answers "yes" to the question, "Can aggression be stopped?" He points out that Great Britain, France and the United States have four-fifths of the world's gold supply. Acting together these nations could, by economic pressure, make it impossible for the fascist aggressors to succeed; plus Scandinavia, plus South America, they could by the denial of economic intercourse, stop war. His basic emphasis is that peace depends on justice. Hitler's conquest of Vienna is not a step towards peace because it is based on injustice. Japan, Hitler and Mussolini are international gangsters. Japan was offered peaceful change in the Lytton Report, but turned it down. Blum offered Hitler the widest economic appeasement in January, 1936, but Hitler refused to answer. Agreed that we are involved in the responsibility for the present situation, this is an insufficient reason why we should not now restrain the aggressor. When isolationists point out that sanctions did not work against Italy, Eichelberger replies, "They would have worked had oil been included."

But the reason oil was left off the embargo list was the power of profit. This force uses both war and the fear of war to accomplish its ends. The basic reason that covenants and sanctions have failed so far to halt war is that our great democratic nations which professed to love peace are capitalistic democracies. As long as the capitalist-imperialist forces control the governments of these nations, they sabotage the covenant-sanction program. Chamberlain's deal with Mussolini and the unprecedented support given it by Roosevelt illustrates this perfectly. Hence the area of struggle is not merely between the democratic and fascist powers, it is also between the democratic and fascist elements within the democracies. In given situations, as for example non-intervention by England and France and neutrality here, the democratic governments can, by sufficient popular pressure, be prevented or stopped from giving aid and comfort to the aggressors. Such action is the approach to their replacement by governments that will carry out a democratic program both national and international. But this

requires wider forces than the middle class intellectuals in the covenant-sanctions grouping, and it requires a more varied program.

PEACEFUL CHANGE

This means settlement of economic grievances and relief from economic disabilities by cooperative adjustments instead of by war. Long worked on by some of the older peace organizations, the current program for peaceful change developed by way of the 1936 report of the Joint Committee of the Carnegie Endowment and the International Chamber of Commerce on problems of international trade, and the search for something to succeed the emergency peace campaign, in which the divergent groups, hopelessly deadlocked over fundamental issues of foreign policy, could unite. So in August 1937 the campaign for world economic cooperation was launched, leading up to the Washington Conference of March 1938.

Since peaceful change is essentially a long view position, safely isolated from the imperious present, its adherents are free to chart economic readjustments necessary for lasting peace. The essential points in such a program expressed in the Van Zeeland Report, the findings of the Washington Conference, and the Headline Series of the Foreign Policy Association (W. T. Stone, Editor), are: (1) Reciprocal trade agreements, (2) Lowering of tariffs and abolishing of import and exchange controls, (3) Stabilization of international exchange, (4) Equality of access to colonial markets and resources. The Washington Conference also emphasized democratic economic planning for increased production and social security to improve the economic basis of peace here. This program covers and only partially conceals a desire of certain groups to come to the aid of the fascist states under a popular international banner—note the Van Zeeland Report with its objective of loans to the fascist powers. Thus, both the general political desires and the economic needs of the holders of idle capital would be met.

This whole program of peaceful change ignores the basic contradictions of the capitalist economy. How can we reduce armaments in the face of permanent unemployment or initiate cooperative economic policies when a declining capitalism generates an increasingly aggressive imperialism? The committee of experts raised this issue at the Washington Conference when it argued that the United States should use its resources not only to relieve economic tensions, but also to make aggression more difficult. The managing group succeeded in preventing a vote on this question, and agreed to publish both points of view. One of the experts, Colston Warne, thus stated the case: "I hold that any effort to divorce the international from the domestic issues of today is highly artificial, and serves only to keep from coming to grips with the question of whether suicidal international policies are not the result of insoluble domestic problems of capitalistic nations."

The advocates of peaceful change have also to reckon with the following facts: There is not enough room for expansion in the capitalist economy to permit concessions that will satisfy the fascist powers. They have other objectives: strategic positions for empire building, racial unity and dominance, the destruction of communism—which these concessions do not touch. If concessions could be made, they would only strengthen the fascist powers for more effective war and they would not solve their economic problems, for the same problems exist in the better situated nations.

ECONOMIC NON-COOPERATION

Those who see that isolation is a myth, that neutrality and non-intervention work to aid the fascist powers, and can find no hope that a powerless League of Nations, or a program of peaceful change will bring reality to their dreams of peace, see the following facts: (1) We are faced with aggressive wars and allied aggressors whose program requires more wars. (2) Their aggression can be stopped now by economic non-cooperation, and then long range economic programs can be discussed. (3) This requires effective cooperation between those who believe in democracy and desire its extension, i.e., the labor, progressive and radical forces in every country. (4) These groups can cooperate to shut off economic aid to the aggressors by a consumers' boycott and by a labor check demanding government embargoes. Such concerted action, accompanied by a declaration of willingness to cooperate in a mutual solution of economic problems when aggression is ended, does not involve entangling alliances or military commitments. It is not the "collective security" of international covenants with penalties for violation, including the use of armed force. It is the only possible substitute for war in dealing with the treaty-breaking, invading nations. It does not imply participation in another war for democracy. If the present aggressors can be halted by concerted economic non-cooperation, then there is a breathing space to deal with the causes of their aggression, to prepare the plans and mobilize the forces for eliminating the roots of war.

The groups rallying to this point of view are led by The American League for Peace and Democracy. Its distinctive characteristics are that, seeing the relationship between war and fascism, it unites the struggle for democratic rights and democratic control with the struggle for peace, and that it has enlisted organized labor and the farm groups in support of its purpose and program.

Concerning the war-making trends in the policies of our own government, the American League has spoken clearly and acted vigorously, in harmony with other anti-war forces, at the following points: opposition to any increase in our military and naval forces beyond the needs of defense of our own coast and borders; opposition to all preparations for war by military mobilization measures or conscription bills; opposition to the policy of defending American interests abroad by armed force; opposition to recognition of territory acquired by conquest. Concerning a referendum on war, the League has endorsed the principle that the people who fight the wars should have a chance to say whether they want to fight them or not, but in view of the time required for a constitutional amendment it has concentrated its energies on measures designed to halt the immediate menace of war. Its emphasis is upon democratic control over our foreign policy in the initial stages through the fullest public discussion of all issues, thus bringing the influence of the people to bear upon their representatives, both executive and legislative.

Concerning the withdrawal of American military and naval forces from China, the League urged our government at the beginning of the conflict to announce to the other signers of the Nine Power Treaty that the time had come to make real the independence of China by withdrawing all foreign troops from her soil and warships from her waters and by ending all national and international concessions which infringe upon the sovereignty of China. It also urged the government to announce that meanwhile its armed forces in China would be used only for the purpose of evacuating our citizens and providing some measure of safety for our diplomatic and consular staffs, that our naval forces would be limited to those necessary for this purpose, and their commanders instructed not to yield to Japanese requests to so dispose our ships as to make easier Japanese attack upon Chinese civilians or its unjustified aggression upon China.

The American League wants our present Neutrality Act revised so as to put a mandatory, water-tight embargo on any war supplies or financial aid to any nation invading another. It wants our markets kept open to the victim of the aggressor under regulations of purchases and shipments designed to remove the risk of our being drawn into war. It wants a foreign policy that refuses trade treaties, loans, credits, war supplies and all other goods above peacetime quotas to those nations proclaiming and carrying out policies of aggression and war. It would refuse to strengthen the war makers by any economic concession until they cease their invasion and cooperate in reduction of armaments. It supports the nationalization of the manufacture of arms, ammunition and implements of war, forbidding export except when ordered by Congress in cases of countries invaded by an aggressor. It promotes the peoples' refusal to buy goods imported from the war making nations, and it supports the refusal of labor to handle war supplies for the aggressor. It wants the embargo on war supplies lifted from Spain and placed upon Germany, Italy and Japan. It regards this as the decisive issue on which there can be no compromise because on it depends the future of democracy, and if democracy goes then the only possible approach to the organization of peace is gone.

The tragedy is that while the peace forces divide the fascist war makers unite. And all the world prepares and thus helps to make more certain the war which their aggression promotes. The price of a failure to achieve sufficient unity to withhold war supplies from the war makers is an inevitable universal conflict.

For the preparation of this Bulletin we are indebted to George Butler, for materials and suggestions to Dick Fagley, and for assistance to Gertrude Sauer.

* * *

HAVE YOU READ:

Toward a Farmer-Labor Party, by Harry W. Laidler (pamphlet published by the League for Industrial Democracy, 112 E. 19th Street, New York City, 15c).

Burgos Justice—A Year's Experience of Nationalist Spain, by Ruiz Vilaplana (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, \$2).

Report of Court Proceedings in the Case of the Anti-Soviet "Bloc of Rights and Trotskyites", published by People's Commissariat of Justice of the U. S. S. R., Moscow, 1938. Workers' Book Shop, 50 East 13th Street, New York City. 75c.